

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figure 1, replaces the original sheet including Figure 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 stand rejected. Claims 4-7, 11, 12, 14 and 20 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval.

The Office objects to the drawing commenting that the drawing must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, therefore, the drawing must show the mobile platform, the mobile platform cabin and the configuration data.

A. Regarding the mobile platform, Applicants respectfully submit that the original Figure 1 clearly indicated the mobile platform as a dashed block form identified at reference numeral 31 and described at paragraph 15. Under 37 CFR §1.83(a) conventional features disclosed in the description and claims where their detailed illustration is not essential for proper understanding of the invention may be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a labeled representation, e.g., a labeled rectangular box. Applicants respectfully submit a detailed illustration of a mobile platform is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention. However, in efforts to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended Figure 1, as illustrated in the attached "Replacement Sheet", to show a solid-line block form mobile platform identified at reference numeral 31 and labeled as "Mobile Platform". Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

B. Regarding the cabin, as set forth above, under 37 CFR §1.83(a) conventional features disclosed in the description and claims where their detailed illustration is not essential for proper understanding of the invention may be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a labeled representation, e.g., a labeled rectangular box. Applicants respectfully submit a detailed illustration of a mobile platform cabin is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the Figure 1, as illustrated in the attached "Replacement Sheet", to include a

cabin, in block form, and have properly labeled the block for identification. The mobile platform cabin is described throughout the specification, e.g., at paragraphs 6, 13 and 14. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

C. Regarding the configuration data, this drawing objection is respectfully traversed. Under 37 C.F.R. §1.81, drawings are required where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented. Applicants respectfully submit that, in view of the specification, claims and drawings, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly and easily understand that the services systems (CSS) 30, of the present invention, is a computer-based communications system. Additionally, one of ordinary skill in the art of computer-based electronic communications systems, such as the CSS 30, would clearly understand the meaning, purpose, function and general form of data of any sort, e.g., configuration data. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly and easily understand such computer-based electronic data to be data stored on, or included in, components of the computer-based system, i.e., the programmable modules 50, 54 and 56 of the CSS 30. Further yet, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly and easily understand that such data is intangible and without physical form. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that pictorially illustrating the configuration data is not necessary for one of ordinary skill in the art to understand the subject matter sought to be patented.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

A. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. Regarding Claims 1-3, 8 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 does not claim that each of the programmable speaker drive modules, overhead electronics units and interface panels is capable of controlling the operation of each of the audio subsystem, the lighting subsystem and the crew interface subsystem. Rather, Applicants respectfully submit that, as described in paragraphs 28 through 35, Claim 1

clearly recites that configuration data is programmed into each of the programmable speaker drive modules, overhead electronics units and interface panels and that the configuration data provides one or more operations of each subsystem. Thus, Claim 1 recites that the configuration data is used to provide operation for each subsystem, not that each programmable module controls each of the other programmable modules.

However, in order to expedite prosecution, the Applicants have amended Claim 1, as set forth above. Particularly, Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in significant part, "...each speaker drive module, each overhead electronics unit and each interface panel includes configuration data used to provide one or more operations of each respective subsystem within a cabin of the mobile platform..."

Applicants respectfully submit that enablement for the portion of amended Claim 1 addressed in the present §112 rejection, is provided at paragraphs 28 through 35 of the application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 depend from amended Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 likewise be withdrawn.

2. Regarding Claims 10, 13 and 15-17, Claim 10 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 15-17 depend from amended Claim 10. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 13 and 15-17 likewise be withdrawn.

3. Regarding Claims 18 and 19, Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 depends from amended Claim 18. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 19 likewise be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 be withdrawn.

B. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. Regarding Claims 1-3, 8 and 9, as set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 does not claim that the programmable speaker modules control lighting operations, or that the programmable overhead electronics units operate the crew interfaces. Rather, Claim 1 clearly recites that configuration data, which is programmed into each of the programmable speaker drive modules, overhead electronics units and interface panels is used to provide operation for each subsystem.

However, in order to expedite prosecution, the Applicants have amended Claim 1, as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3 8 and 9 depend from amended Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 likewise be withdrawn.

2. Regarding Claims 10, 13 and 15-17, Claim 10 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 15-17 depend from amended Claim 10. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 13 and 15-17 likewise be withdrawn.

3. Regarding Claims 18 and 19, Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 depends from amended Claim 18. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 19 likewise be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 be withdrawn.

C. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. Regarding Claims 1-3, 8 and 9, as set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 is not indefinite and particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would easily and clearly understand what is meant by the limitation of amended Claim 1 reciting, "...wherein each speaker drive module, each overhead electronics unit and each interface panel includes configuration data used to provide one or more operations of each respective subsystem within a cabin of the mobile platform..." Use of data is commonly understood to mean that the data is utilized in achieving a specific result. That is, the data is operated on, e.g., by a computer executed algorithm or logic expression or by hand calculations, to obtain a result or output, which is used for an intended purpose. For example, as recited in amended Claim 1, the configuration data is utilized, i.e., operated on, by each respective programmable module to provide one or more operations of the related subsystem. As a further example, the programmable overhead units utilize, i.e., operate on, the configuration data to provide one or more operations of the lighting subsystem, e.g., turning on a light.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the description set forth in paragraphs 28 through 35, one of ordinary skill would easily and clearly understand the limitations recited in the portion of amended Claim 1 to which the Office is objecting.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 is not claiming a black-box. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office must read

amended Claim 1 as a whole, interpreting all the limitations recited therein and their interrelations. Amended Claim 1 does not claim a particular or specific algorithm that utilizes the configuration data to achieve a specific output. Rather, amended Claim 1 recites a system with the various claimed subsystems including the related programmable modules, wherein the system incorporates configuration data included in the programmable modules to provide one or more operations, i.e., functions, of the each of the various subsystems. It is not necessary for amended Claim 1 to recite a specific structure of the configuration data or specific algorithms or logic expressions that are executed to operate on the configuration data, because amended Claim 1 is not claiming specific structure of the configuration data or specific algorithms or logic expressions that are executed to operate on the configuration data. Rather, amended Claim 1 is claiming a system that includes the specific recited components that include the configuration data and have the interrelations as specifically related, wherein the system uses the configuration data to provide one or more operations of the components included in the system, as specifically recited.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Moreover, Applicants additionally submit that, when interpreted in light of the description set forth in the detailed description of the application, it is abundantly clear that amended Claim 1 particularly claims and distinctly points out the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3 8 and 9 depend from amended Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 likewise be withdrawn.

2. Regarding Claims 10, 13 and 15-17, Claim 10 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 15-17 depend from amended Claim 10. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 13 and 15-17 likewise be withdrawn.

3. Regarding Claims 18 and 19, Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 depends from amended Claim 18. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 19 likewise be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 be withdrawn.

D. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. Regarding Claims 1-3, 8 and 9, Claim 1 has been amended, as set forth above, to particularly point out and distinctly claim a cabin services system for use within a cabin of a mobile platform. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 depend from amended Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 likewise be withdrawn.

2. Regarding Claims 10, 13 and 15-17, Claim 10 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 15-17 depend from amended Claim 10. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 13 and 15-17 likewise be withdrawn.

3. Regarding Claims 18 and 19, Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 depends from amended Claim 18. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 19 likewise be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 be withdrawn.

E. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. The Office comments that the specification does not enable all cars, building, bicycles, motorcycles, elevators, etc., and that the scope of the claims is such that they incorporate all platforms capable of moving, to include bikes, scooters, convertible cars, pleasure boats and unmanned aircraft.

i. Regarding Claims 1-3, 8 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit the scope of amended Claim 1 is restricted to mobile platforms having a cabin and a crew. The preamble of amended Claim 1 recites, "A cabin services system for use within a cabin of a mobile platform...", and paragraph four (4) of amended Claim 1 recites, "...at least one crew interface subsystem including a plurality of programmable interface panels..." Thus, the scope of amended Claim 1 is limited to mobile platforms having a cabin and a crew, for example, as the Office points out, a mobile platform having a crew would include such mobile platforms as tourist buses, aircraft, spaceships and large boats. Applicants respectfully suggest that this would also encompass such mobile platforms as buses, trains, etc. Enablement for such mobile platforms is provided throughout the specification, for example at paragraphs 1, 3, 13, 15 and 45. Additionally, the Office comments that the specification *is* enabling for such mobile platforms as boats and aircraft. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 depend from amended Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 likewise be withdrawn.

ii. Regarding Claims 10, 13 and 15-17, Claim 10 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 15-17 depend from amended Claim 10. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 13 and 15-17 likewise be withdrawn.

iii. Regarding Claims 18 and 19, Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 depends from amended Claim 18. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 19 likewise be withdrawn.

2. The Office additionally comments that the term “mobile platform” is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite.

i. Regarding Claims 1-3, 8 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit the scope of amended Claim 1 is restricted to mobile platforms, i.e., passenger transportation vehicles, having a cabin and a crew. Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill would easily and clearly understand the meaning of the term “mobile platform” when interpreted in light of the specification. The term “mobile platform” is described in exemplary fashion throughout the specification, for example at paragraphs 1, 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 26, 34 and 45.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office, being one skilled in the art, clearly understood the meaning of the term “mobile platform” in that all the examples of mobile platform listed by the Office in the preceding rejection identified mobile vehicles that transport at least one passenger. For example, the Office lists as possible mobile platforms bikes, scooters, convertible cars, pleasure boats and

unmanned aircraft. Thus, the Office clearly understood the scope of the term “mobile platform” to be limited to moving vehicles for transporting at least one passenger. Additionally, the Office comments that the specification *is* enabling for such mobile platforms as boats and aircraft. Thus, the Office clearly understood the scope of the term “mobile platform” to be further limited to passenger transportation vehicles having a cabin and a crew. Enablement for such mobile platforms, i.e., passenger transportation vehicles, is provided throughout the specification, for example at paragraphs 1, 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 26, 34 and 45. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 depend from amended Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 likewise be withdrawn.

ii. Regarding Claims 10, 13 and 15-17, Claim 10 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 15-17 depend from amended Claim 10. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 13 and 15-17 likewise be withdrawn.

iii. Regarding Claims 18 and 19, Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 depends from amended Claim 18. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 19 likewise be withdrawn.

3. The Office additionally comments that the term “platform” is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite.

i. Regarding Claims 1-3, 8 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit the scope of amended Claim 1 is restricted to mobile platforms, i.e, passenger transportation vehicles, having a cabin and a crew such as aircraft, buses, ships, trains, etc. As set

forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office, being one of skill in the art, clearly understood the meaning of the term “mobile platform”. Applicants do not claim a “platform”, but rather, Applicants claim a “mobile platform”, which, as set forth above, would be clearly and easily understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants respectfully submit that it is improper to dissect terms of the claims and base rejections on single words of a term, absent modifying or defining words of the term. Applicants respectfully submit that the term “mobile platform” should be interpreted as a whole. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants request that the §112 rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Office recites the definition of “platform” as found from Answers.com to include “a vessel... from which weapons can be deployed”. Applicant, respectfully submits that Merriam-Webster Online dictionary (m-w.com) defines “platform” as “a vehicle (as a satellite or aircraft) used for a particular activity or purpose or to carry a usually specified kind of equipment”. Applicants respectfully submit that various other extrinsic sources could be consulted that would give various other definitions. Applicants further respectfully submit that the Office is improperly interpreting the scope of the claim based on one extrinsic source without proper interpretation of the meaning as set forth in the specification. Applicants respectfully direct the Office’s attention to the recent Federal Circuit holding in *Phillips v. AWH Corporation*, stating that the meaning derived from extrinsic sources is of lesser value in comparison to the contextual meaning provided by the specification and claims. As set forth above, the meaning of the word “platform” and more properly the term “mobile platform” is clearly described throughout the specification. Therefore, Applicants request that the §112 rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 depend from amended Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 likewise be withdrawn.

ii. Regarding Claims 10, 13 and 15-17, Claim 10 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 15-17 depend from amended Claim 10. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 13 and 15-17 likewise be withdrawn.

iii. Regarding Claims 18 and 19, Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 depends from amended Claim 18. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants further respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 19 likewise be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13 and 15-19 be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7525.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/11/05

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, MO 63105
314-726-7500

By: 
Scott T. Gray, Reg. No. 48,891